

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated November 30, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on February 28, 2007. Claims 1-6 have been examined. The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Takeuchi, US 6,646,317, in view of Bischel, US 5,513,196. The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Takeuchi, Bischel, and "Packaging Relaxed Semiconductor Lasers with Diluted Waveguide Structure" by Choa, et al., published by IEEE in 1994.

### *Specification*

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because the term "generators" as used in describing the input face as a cylindrical diopter is not adequately defined in the disclosure. In response, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to paragraph 0028 in the published application where it states that "the input face is advantageously a cylindrical diopter with generators perpendicular to the plane of the said light-absorbing layer" and paragraph 0029, in the published application, where it states that "the light is confined along the perpendicular to the plane of the said light-absorbing layer." The specification clearly indicates the term "generators" relates to the pathway of light through the input face. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request the objection to the specification be removed.

### *Claim Objections*

The Examiner objected to claim 2 because the term "generators" is not adequately disclosed in the disclosure. As set forth above, the specification clearly indicates the term "generators" relates to the pathway of light through the input face. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the objection to the claims be removed.

### *Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)*

The Examiner rejected claim 1 as being obvious over Takeuchi in view of Bischel. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

According to MPEP 2143.03, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed

invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Claim 1 includes the limitation of an input face that is convex. As correctly indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action, Takeuchi fails to disclose an input face that is convex. As such, the Examiner appears to rely on a convex integrated lens “510” of Bischel to teach an input face that is convex. However, Bischel also fails to disclose that the input face is convex. In contrast, Bischel merely discloses a filter structure having a flat AR coated input face “422” (see Bischel, Figure 9). Further, Bischel clearly states that the lens “510” is embedded in a planar waveguide such that it extends at least from the AR coated input face “422” of the mode filter structure to the beginning of an optional tapered horn region (see Bischel, col. 20, lines 50-55). In other words, the convex integrated lens “510” of Bischel is disposed in the filter structure between the flat AR coated input face “422” and the horned region. Thus, the convex integrated lens “510” of Bischel cannot be the input face. As such, Bischel does not teach an input face that is convex, as set forth in claim 1. As the forgoing illustrates, that combination of Takeuchi and Bischel fails to disclose an input face that is convex. This failure precludes the combination of Takeuchi and Bischel from rendering claim 1 obvious. Applicants therefore submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection. Additionally, since claims 2-4 and 6 depend from claim 1, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Takeuchi, Bischel, and “Packaging Relaxed Semiconductor Lasers with Diluted Waveguide Structure.” Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and as set forth above, the combination of Takeuchi and Bischel fails to teach or suggest all the limitations in claim 1. Further, “Packaging Relaxed Semiconductor Lasers with Diluted Waveguide Structure” fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of Takeuchi and Bischel. This failure precludes the combination of Takeuchi, Bischel, and “Packaging Relaxed Semiconductor Lasers with Diluted Waveguide Structure” from rendering claim 5 obvious. Applicants therefore submit that claim 5 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection.


### *New Claims*

New claims 7-20 have been added to claim aspects of the present invention. Applicants submit that no new subject matter has been added in new claims 7-20. Further, claims 7-10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Additionally, claims 11-20 include the limitation of a convex or a cylindrical diopter shaped input face. As set forth above, the combination of Takeuchi, Bischel, and "Packaging Relaxed Semiconductor Lasers with Diluted Waveguide Structure" fail to disclose a shaped input face. For these reasons, Applicants believe that new claims 7-20 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request the same.

### *Conclusion*

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the case is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter C. Grollitsch  
Registration No. 48,678  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants